

b. Remarks

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, and 20 stand rejected. Claim 1 has been canceled. Claims 2 through 35, as amended, are pending in the application. Claims 2, 5-7, 10 through 19, and 21 through 27 have been objected to, but are believed to now be in condition for allowance. Claims 28 through 35 have been allowed.

1. Rejection under §102(b)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Rodenberg, III et al. Claim 1 has been cancelled. Amended Claim 3 depends on allowable, newly independent Claim 2, and is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 4 depends on Claim 3. Claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations of base Claim 1, and the words “breaker panel” have been inserted in part (a). Claims 9 and 20 depend on Claim 8.

2. Allowable Subject Matter

The Office action acknowledges that Claims 2, 5-7, 10-19, and 21-27, as well as Claims 28-35, are directed to allowable subject matter. The first set of claims (2, 5-7, 10-19, and 21-27), which were objected to, have been rewritten in independent form and the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims have been included. The limitation of intervening, rejected Claim 8 (RDU is linked with a personal computer by a connection through an RDU interface) was not included in amended Claim 10 (RDU is connected to a PDA through a serial, USB, or firewire connection), though. (The primary reason for indication of allowance provided on page 4 of the Office action did not mention the Claim 8 limitation.) Also, the words “breaker panel” have been inserted in part (a) of amended Claim 21. Antecedent basis is provided in, for example, the FIG. 1 description on pages 7 and 8 of the specification.

Application No. 10/663,313

Four of the claims in the first set, 2, 5, 10, and 21, have been amended and are now independent. The other claims in the first set, 6, 7, 11-19, and 22-27, depend on one of the independent claims. (Claims 26 and 27 depend on Claim 8 or 9.) Since Claims 16 and 23-25 depended on Claim 1, which has been cancelled, they have been amended to depend on Claims 10 or 5, respectively. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment.

As a matter of form, the dependent claims have been amended to substitute the article “The” for the article “A”. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment.

Regarding the second set of claims, Claims 28 through 35 have been allowed. Dependent Claims 29-35 have been amended to substitute the article “The” for the article “A” as a matter of form. Also, Claim 33 is now numbered correctly. (It was originally incorrectly numbered 36 even though it falls between Claims 32 and 34.) No new matter has been introduced by this amendment.

Applicants seek to gain an auspicious allowance and have therefore voluntarily amended the claims. According to the Office action, the drawings have been accepted by the Examiner. The fee for the additional independent claims is enclosed herein.

Applicants would be pleased to supply additional information in support of this application, or to discuss over the telephone any additional amendments the Examiner considers necessary to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants request that these amendments be made of record in the case and considered by the United States Patent and Trademark Office Examiner, and that the claims as amended be allowed.

Application No. 10/663,313

Respectfully submitted,
The Harleston Law Firm, LLC

By: Kathleen M. Harleston

Kathleen M. Harleston
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,398

Mailed to USPTO on March 31, 2005

The Harleston Law Firm, LLC
909 Tall Pine Road
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
843-971-9453 Phone
843-971-9505 Fax
kathleen@harlestonlawfirm.com